

01
02
03
04
05
06 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
07 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

08 MICHAEL A. RILEY,) CASE NO. C09-1013-RSL-MAT
09 Plaintiff,)
10 v.) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
11 ROBERT J. PALMQUIST, et al.,) REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF
12 Defendants.) COUNSEL
13 _____)

14 Plaintiff Michael A. Riley proceeds *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in this 42 U.S.C.
15 § 1983 civil rights case. He seeks appointment of counsel to represent him. (Dkt. 8.) As
16 plaintiff's complaint was only recently served, there is no response from defendants. Now,
17 having reviewed plaintiff's request, as well as the remainder of the record, the Court does
18 hereby find and ORDER:

19 (1) There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under § 1983.
20 Although the Court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), can request counsel to represent a party
21 proceeding IFP, plaintiff has shown neither exceptional circumstances, nor an inability to
22 articulate his claims *pro se* that would warrant the appointment of counsel at this time. *See*

01 *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986). Accordingly, plaintiff's motion
02 for appointment of counsel (Dkt. 8) is DENIED.

03 (2) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff, to defendants, and
04 to the Honorable Robert S. Lasnik.

05 DATED this 9th day of September, 2009.

06
07 
08 Mary Alice Theiler
09 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22